DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 055 UD 026 279

AUTHOR Collins, Thomas W.; Noblit, George W.
TITLE The Process of Interracial Schooling: A Literature Review and Examination of the Relationship between Conceptual Framework and Research Methodology in Literature on Interracial Education.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.s
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 400-76-009
NOTE 78p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; *Public Schools; Qualitative Research; *Racial Integration; Racial Relations; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; Research Problems; *School Desegregation; Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

The goals of this selective review are to analyze and organize the literature on the process of interracial education, and to examine the relationship between the researcher's conceptual framework and the research methodology employed. The topics treated within the literature include the following: (1) law and politics; (2) community concerns; (3) school administration; (4) order and discipline; (5) curriculum and instruction; (6) faculty; (7) co-curricular activities; (8) extraschool factors; and (9) consequences for youth. Areas needing more research include the following: (1) social theory; (2) field studies that use a variety of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies; (3) qualitative classroom studies; and (4) co-curricular activities. The three research methodologies employed in the literature are the following: (1) commentary; (2) qualitative research; and (3) quantitative research. The two conceptual frameworks of criticism represented within the literature assume the following: (1) the institution of public education is faulty; or (2) problems are caused by either participant inadequacies or by technical difficulties in implementation. Either conceptual framework may be involved in commentary. Quantitative research is more usually associated with the conceptual framework that attributes problems to factors outside the control of the school. Qualitative research is more usually associated with criticism of the institution as it exists within society. A list of over 200 references is included. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ONLY COPY 7-7-88 UD
PLS DoNOT Remove

ED297055

The Process of Interracial Schooling: A Literature Review and Examination of the Relationship Between Conceptual Framework and Research Methodology in Literature on Interracial Education

by

Thomas W. Collins
George W. Noblit*

Interracial Education Project
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

*This literature review is part of an ongoing research effort in which we are alternating the order of authors' names to indicate that the products are in every way joint efforts. The work upon which the literature review is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-009 with the Field Studies in Urban Desegregated Schools Program of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency. The authors wish to thank Clata Finn and Robert Weymouth for their significant contributions to this effort.

UD026279

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The process of interracial education has been and continues to be a subject of much controversy, and underlines the political nature of the history of public education in this country. The scientific research, reasoned debate and emotional diatribes render judgments of the process that are highly diverse in substance not only between the modes of expression, but also within them. This creates some difficulty in any attempt to review and synthesize the literature. All too often such attempts, while cognizant of this, do not attempt to systematically account for these diversities. This literature attempts to incorporate an analysis and possible explanation(s) of the diversity through an investigation of the relationship of research methodology and conceptual framework employed in the analysis of the process of interracial education. Thus, it will be possible to gain some understanding of how methodology and explanation interact. This would seem to be significant to all those who are to fund research, conduct research and/or read research findings. If there seems to be more or less systematic patterns emerging from this endeavor, then all three audiences may be able to better organize their thoughts relative to school interracial processes as well as understand some of the limitations that may impinge upon the existent literature and the findings represented, and research that is needed.

ORGANIZATION OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature is organized into nine "issue" areas that were inductively derived. They are:

1. Law and Politics
2. Community Concerns
3. School Administration
4. Order and Discipline
5. Curriculum and Instruction
6. Faculty
7. Co-Curricular Activities
8. Extraschool Factors
9. Consequences of Interracial Schooling for Youth

Each of these areas will be discussed separately with the exception of co-curricular activities for which there was little literature available. Co-curricular activities will be discussed as part of the concluding remarks.

It is undeniable that these categories do not incompass all of the issues that exist or have been suggested. However, the attempt was to organize the mass of literature into the most parsimonious scheme possible without grossly misrepresenting, hopefully, both the themes in the literatures and the authors' intentions. It should be noted that this review is not an exhaustive one.[1] The vast amount of literature precluded any such attempt. Meyer Weinberg (1970), however, has organized

---

[1]The bibliography includes all references cited in text plus some additional references that are important to discussion herein, but were not cited in the text.

an exhaustive bibliography worthy of perusal by those concerned with interracial education.

Within each issue area we have attempted to abstract the predominate themes and/or concerns. It should be emphasized that only what seemed to be the major themes will be reviewed. Minor or underlying themes could not even be outlined in a review of limited length. Further, it is evident that the concerns with the process of interracial education are not easily broken down into discrete themes. Many authors are trying to represent it wholistically, and with some success. Nevertheless, the themes and concerns do seem to be discrete enough to allow this review. This, of course, may violate some of the intentions of the authors at the time of their writing or their present thinking. It is hoped that this is rare, and that the authors will be tolerant with the attempt to achieve the goals of this review.

To explore the hypothesis that research methodology and conceptual framework are related, it was first necessary to create decision rules about what constitutes what type of research methodology. It appears that three methodologies exist: commentary, quantitative research and qualitative research. Yet, distinctions even between these three were often difficult. The line between commentary and some expressions of qualitative research is sometimes fuzzy; as is the line between quantitative and qualitative research that use observational techniques that count behaviors. The decisions in both situations are based on how the material was treated by the authors. If the author seemed to view the study as qualitative, it was treated as such.

The conceptual frameworks are as inductively derived from each issue area of the literature. Some issue areas have more variety in conceptual frameworks than others. The conclusion will attempt to examine the implications of this pattern.

LAW AND POLITICS

There are many excellent summary reviews of the Federal Court decisions covering the years since Brown vs. Board of Education (Jones 1974; Kirp 1968; C. V. Smith 1975). Perhaps the best analysis is put forth by Read (1975:10) where he divides the past two decades into four historical periods. They are as follows:

> The first period covers the time frame between Brown II in 1955 and the James Meredith affair in 1963. It is characterized by a series of pitched judicial battles over token desegregation. The second period, covering the years between 1963 and 1967, is typified by the struggles of the lower federal courts, without the Supreme Court guidance, to evolve desegregation standards and to break down entrenched local resistance. The third period, from 1968 through 1972, is the period of judicial revolution in the Deep South; federal courts, stung by Supreme Court impatience, issued decrees mandating massive integration. The fourth period, from the Supreme Court's holding in Swann v. Charlotte-Meckleburg Board of Education in 1971 to date, is characterized by confusion over the future of integration, attempts to move integration activity from the South to the ghettos and barrios of the East and West, and litigation over a host of second-generation integration problems.

During the second period (1963-67), pushed by the Civil Rights movement, Congress passed the first meaningful legislation in the cause of equal education and reform; the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In particular, Title VI enabled a social revolution to begin by holding that discriminatory school programs could no longer be supported with federal dollars. The full power of this Act was not apparent until the following year when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was passed by Congress making larger amounts of federal funding available to Southern school districts. Batten (1970) states Title VI shifted the burden of dismantling the dual school system of the South from the federal judiciary to the federal bureaucracy. The Office of Education in HEW sent their representatives out to districts to review compliance with the HEW Guidelines and

recommended federal fund cut-offs where necessary. Thus, local civil rights groups were able to receive an immediate review of their complaints on discrimination rather than proceed through the long and expensive court litigation of earlier years. Ultimately the power of Title VI was focused on the districts which formerly maintained dual (de jure) systems (Craven 1970; Orfield 1969).

Massive desegregation became a fact of life for all Southern districts during the period between 1968-72. The Supreme Court was impatient when it handed down its decision on Green v. County School Board in May, 1968 (roughly one month after Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination and the subsequent wide-scale rioting in many urban centers). Green ended "freedom-of-choice" plans as a method of desegregation. This method had only produced token attendance of blacks in formally all-white schools. Emphasis was now placed on percentages of racial-mixing in Southern schools and plans had to be implemented immediately. Thus, the public school districts of the South capitulated to the courts and integrated their system.

From 1972 to the present, the major concern has been placed on student assignments for racial mixing. In 1971, in Swann v. Charlotte-Meckleburg, the Supreme Court authorized altering of attendance zones. For the first time, busing became an "accepted tool of education polity." Local district plans could no longer be limited to walk-in schools. There were other means (e.g. pairing and grouping of attendance zones) but as Foster (1973) points out, most of them had failed. Busing was the new remedy for cities; North and South.

Perhaps the most controversial option of all desegregation plans is busing. The literature on busing is extensive. There are excellent

case studies and analyses of particular aspects of busing experiences written on Greenville and Greensburo (Bagwell 1972), Memphis (Egerton 1973), Centerline (LaPorte, Becker, Willie 1965), Louisville (Perly 1975), Pontiac (Efthim 1971), Inglewood (Bonacich and Goodman 1972), Charlottesville, Providence and Sacramento (Holden 1974). Cottle (1975) details the legal ploys used to prevent racial-mixing in Boston. The politics of desegregation at the community level comparing eight Northern cities and seven Southern cities is provided by Crain (1968). The various political maneuvering, the factionalism and policy adjustments are detailed in most of the studies.

Social scientists have also contributed a number of studies on the impact of busing on the student. Perhaps David Armor's (1972) work is the most widely cited in the literature. He attempted to assess the effects of busing on academic achievement, aspirations, self-concept, race-relations and educational opportunities in five different cities from Riverside, California to White Plains, New York. He concludes that mandatory busing for purposes of improving student achievement and interracial harmony is not effective and should not be adopted. Although this policy recommendation warmed the hearts of the anti-integration forces, it was rejected out of hand by the pro-integration forces. Thomas Pettigrew et al. (1973) produced an extensive criticism of Armor's work. In their rebuttal, Pettigrew et al. assailed Armor's standards for judgment (i.e., busing is successful if it leads to increased achievement in one year) and its methodological weaknesses. Also, they assert that the study simply ignored busing programs which have been reported as successful.

Weinberg (1975) carried out a comprehensive review of the relationship of desegregation and academic achievement. He concludes there

can be gains in achievement of racial minorities if the following characteristics are present during desegregation:

1. a relative absence of interracial hostility among students,
2. teachers and administrators who understand and accept minority students, encouraged and reinforced by aggressive in-service training programs,
3. the majority of students in a given classroom are from middle and/or upper socioeconomic classes,
4. desegregation at the classroom as well as at the school level, particularly in elementary schools,
5. no rigid ability grouping or tracking, particularly in elementary schools,
6. an absence of racial conflict in the community over desegregation, and
7. younger children are involved (though this last conclusion should be considered very tentative).

Summary

There remains a great deal of confusion as to how the courts have arrived at the decisions in desegregation cases. Taylor et al. (1976) summarizes the legal principles that govern courts. In spite of the insistence of masses of sociological and educational studies since Brown, they conclude most court orders are based on constitutional considerations and such matters as the stability of desegregation plans rather than sociological theory.

The legal and political literature is essentially commentary and qualitative, and there is little variation in conceptual framework by mode of expression. Yet some quantitative and qualitative research is called for that compiles what the judges consider credible evidence and viable remedies. Thus, the legal/political process of school desegregation may become more lucid.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Coleman (1976) and Coleman et al. (1975) raises the issue of school segregation by districts resulting from desegregation within districts. Compiling data from both large and small districts across the U.S., he concludes school desegregation is a causal factor in white flight. However, other research does not support this position. Everett Cataldo et al. (1975) in their Florida study found the rejection rate (children leaving a newly desegregated school) to be less than four percent. In another well-researched study in Baltimore, Stinchcombe et al. (1969) determined that once a school is desegregated the proportion of blacks will rise each year at a steady rate of seven percent per year. The critical change, or what they refer to as the "tipping point," is linked to supply and demand of housing rather than racial balance in the schools. Whites simply have more alternatives than do blacks which intensifies the need for black housing. Once a neighborhood is open to blacks they tend to fill up all available housing. Rossell (1975a; 1975b) makes a similar conclusion about linkage of flight to housing needs. Orfield (1975), in addition to housing, lists several more factors influencing the rate of racial transition of the cities (e.g., urban riots, increasing crime and violence, rising city taxation rates, decline in central city services). But as Rossell adds, "it is not enough to say white flight is not increased by school desegregation. We need to know how to stop flight altogether" (1975a; 689).

The black community and some of its leadership appear to be having second thoughts about desegregation. Blacks find their children burdened with abnormally high suspension rates relative to that of whites (Bell 1972) rigid tracking systems, and quite often, tokenism rather than a reasonable racial ratio or "critical mass" (Pettigrew 1975; Rist 1974, 1976). Black spokesmen such as Charles Hamilton (1968) and Shirley Chisholm (1975) see busing and other desegregation plans as a reduction in resources and control of minorities communities. It is difficult for parents to participate (e.g., PTA meetings) in their child's education when he or she is bused out of the neighborhood. Moreover, it is impossible for black parents to make alliance with black teachers to promote better schools. As Hamilton (quoted in Ravitch 1976) testified against busing before a Congressional Committee, "blacks need more economic and political self-sufficiency more than they need racially balanced schools."

Perhaps the best recent community study to be produced by an anthropologist emphasizing formal education involvement is Ogbu's (1974) work in Stockton, California. It is a multiethnic situation where each group must negotiate with the power of the school. He sees community historical factors influencing education in terms of performance of children in school. In a sense it is an adaptation to the realities of the economic conditions of the community (i.e., life chances in an unstable job market). Thus, Ogbu argues, there is a loss of desire to perform or compete effectively in school work. The school system contributes to this situation by defining problems in psychological and clinical terms. He concludes, by saying the schools have not changed their treatment of subordinate minorities; the basic orientations are still determined by the ideas and policies of the dominant group.

There is a trend in the literature to question the continuing benefits of desegregation for black children. Ravitch (1976) presents one of the best commentaries on the changing attitudes among black schools. In districts such as Atlanta where the blacks now control city government and the school administration, there is no interest in diluting its base of political power by busing children out to suburban districts. Decentralization of large districts is encouraged by Solomon (1970) to increase the local control by black parents. And Glasser (1969) states it is workable. The chaos created in the experiment in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville area of New York was not caused by local community control but resulted from efforts to undermine community control. Indeed this experiment demonstrates the potential of the black community to organize (Weinburg 1971). But first greater equality must be achieved in financing to insure the effectiveness of the smaller districts (Singleton 1975).

The entire argument of community control is best summed up by Kenneth Clark (quoted in Weinburg 1971) where he states the issue of control is "a demand for school accountability by parents to whom the schools have never accounted, particularly those parents of low status groups in northern cities." Ultimately the issue may best be resolved by an alliance between teachers and parents (Hunt 1976).

Summary

In sum, the literature on community concerns is extensive, particularly on busing and white flight. The quantitative studies are restricted to the areas of anticipated events such as scheduled busing programs in which attitudes of parents and changes in student performance can be measured. Many studies are longitudinal analyzing the community

conflict, factionalism, decision making, the position or role of elites. There are a number of studies of conflicts generated by community involvement or protests in the administration of the schools where the data are gathered post hoc through interviews of critical informants. The nature of the issues seems to restrict these studies to qualitative analysis. Some attempts to quantify conflict might be interesting but would not seem to be particularly promising. Recent commentary indicates a general need for studies of black communities where real political power has been achieved through demographic changes in large cities (e.g., Atlanta; Newark). It has been noted, for example, that the civil rights lawyers are no longer in touch with the changing attitudes of blacks in these new situations.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Dilemma

One of the educational issues most often raised in the process of desegregation concerns the responsiveness of educators to make decisions necessary to successfully implement change. While school administrators have acted to initiate programs to rectify the segregated aspects of inner-city life, it is argued that these ameliorative curriculums have only reinforced inequality (Berlowitz 1974; Rist 1972). Lower-class ghetto children have previously been educated in neighborhood schools, isolated from the larger, more predominant cultural patterns, yet expected to achieve according to the standards set forth by the majority system (Levine 1972). Inasmuch as segregated black neighborhood schools often had equal teaching staffs and materials when compared to similar white schools (Coleman 1966), the overall quality of resources devoted to education of minority children and white children was (and is) greatly in favor of the latter (Berlowitz 1974; Clinget 1974). As a result, says Stewart (1965), efforts to desegregate schools to provide equal education have initiated modified programs to suit disadvantaged children and often are perceived to do injustice to advantaged children. When whites speculate that the quality of education for their children is declining, they have often opposed busing to achieve equal education (Cataldo, Giles and Gatlin 1975). Administrators are thus caught in controversy between white parents, who perceive education as declining in quality, and minority communities, who view their education as innately inferior.

Response

If, as Rist (1973) maintains, education is a form of secular religion, then administrators, teachers and counselors act as priests. The failure of some administrators, teachers, etc. to respond to crisis in the school environment indicates that they are well satisfied with the "faith" of the educational institution and that problems encountered are due to individual attributes found in protesting students and surrounding communities. In fact, many school personnel maintain that there are not any problems (Winecoff and Kelly 1971). Also, principals and teachers in minority schools often isolate themselves from their students by opening social distance and classifying ethnic minorities with stereotypes, and are thus blinded to real issues in the schools which affect both students and the community. If problems are recognized, they are often viewed as political by school boards (Ziegler and Boss 1974) especially if civil rights activity in the locale is high. Nevertheless, community involvement appears to be the major catalyst in revising school policy (Fuchs 1966; Ziegler and Boss 1974). When school boards do respond to community demands for change, consensus in the literature seems to suggest that the principal is the most important person in the school hierarchy regarding successful transition of the educational process. In the midst of school controversy, the principal is often the man in the middle (Turbowitz 1971; Levy 1970) and may be defined as saviour or scapegoat, depending on the community perspective. Abney (1974) reports that black principals are often demoted to assistant positions or back to classroom teaching as desegregation is accomplished. When race is the issue, Cottle (1970) states that the black principal is abused and outraged in every event and is handicapped in administrative decision making by constant

criticism. Although black administrators are singled out for criticism, especially by whites, many principals are under fire for statements or procedures defined as racist by the local community. Fuchs in Pickets at the Gates (1966) cites a case study in which a white principal inflamed the surrounding parent population by giving a letter of instruction to incoming teachers warning them of certain class-linked student characteristics which would have to be compensated for. In this case, the school board backed the parents and the principal, dazed by the controversy, amended his remarks.

A very major concern of school administrators is the application of discipline in maintaining a proper educational environment. As Rist (1972) points out, the greatest consideration given is not whether to use violence, but when to use it. Principals, teachers, counselors and custodians are involved in the cycle of the school milieu in which a crisis atmosphere determines the learning experience which, in turn, affects the response of teachers and the principal, providing the general social themes of the school (Rist 1972). Administrators, acting under the assumption that disruption is bad and what is being disrupted is good, leave things alone until school problems reach crisis proportions (Redl 1975). This cautious stance is often cited in the literature (Stewart 1965; Fish 1970; Bailey 1971; Schreck, Harper and Goroff 1975). Inability or unwillingness to take innovative action to rectify violent school situations may be a function of the position of administrators in the institution of education. As Reimer (1971) states, administrators are prisioners of their own institutions, barely accomplishing educational missions before turning around and bowing to them. Reverence for the efficiency of education is not confined to principals and board members, however. Guidance personnel routinely advise lower-class children to take educational courses which are assumed to be

beneficial and interesting, but actually are class related (Rist 1973). Counselors give their advice to students assuming that they are acting in humane, egalitarian ways which the code of educational standards calls for. Actually, counselors channel lower-class students into dead-end courses, thus limiting their job futures (Smith 1971). As Boney, Dunn and Bass (1971) point out, socialization of the lower-class student affects the counseling relationship, but Smith (1971) would reply that the middle-class socialization of the counselor would be more of a determinant factor in the implications for career direction of the youth. Counselors may be instrumental in determining career patterns, but the economic dead end resulting from class-linked or subsidiary occupational choices would explain a high degree of dissatisfaction on the part of communities with educational outcomes. The obvious controversy over benefits of education thus falls back into the laps of principals, superintendents and school boards.

Change

Insofar as the school administration is unwilling to deal with controversy without great public pressure, response to that pressure and action for constructive change usually can occur through an activist principal, especially when bolstered by staff support (Fish 1971; Orfield 1975; Goldsborough 1971; Levine 1972; Bailey 1971). Much of the literature indicates that an activist principal is able to elicit greater support through community involvement, establishment of open channels of communication with the client public, students and teachers, and by evolving strategies of crisis prevention rather than intervention (Bailey 1971; Schreck, Harper and Goroff 1975; Stewart 1965; Goldsborough 1971; Orfield 1975). Any large scale system-wide attempt at change must be accompanied by adequate sources of information for all administrators concerned. The

failure of the Clark Plan in Washington was apparently partly due to the ignorance of many teachers, administrators and members of the community of the changes, techniques and goals of the plan (Cuban 1970). Thus, the school administrators should pass down the line enough information to elicit support and adequate understanding of changes implemented.

Some literature suggests, however, that commitment to change on the part of administrators is insufficient without concomitant cultural/structural changes within the school system (Fuchs 1969; Hillson 1967; Stewart 1965). As Rist (1972) suggests, American education is structured to perpetuate social and economic inequalities found within society. Berlowitz (1974) agrees that schools reinforce inequality through inferior teaching staffs. Educators, imbued with the ethos of middle-class America, develop controlling attitudes and methods of thought; intending to impress upon all the myths of educational and occupational opportunity (Bergen 1968). School process then may be viewed as cultural imperialism, with ghetto children as the population to be colonized. Learning is, thus, organized to maintain the established order, and poverty and addiction as well as disruptive violence are viewed as individual failings, not structural defects (Carnoy 1974). The drift of these arguments would indicate that as long as schools act as a sorting device for society, administrative efforts at educational change on a large scale are probably doomed. Problems of schooling are problems contained in the greater context of American society and despite the efforts of active administrators, the literature suggests that little permanent change will be produced from efforts within the current system (Sexton 1964).

Summary

The research on the administration of desegregated schools has mostly concentrated upon examining the role of the professional in the context of disruptive school environments. Some descriptions of administrative process in non-crisis settings would seem to help set the stage for an understanding of the relationship of administrative procedures and crisis. But particularly, it would seem that a major area of needed research concerns the perceived powerlessness of administrators, particularly principals. As will be discussed in the conclusions for the order and discipline section, alternative organizational forms and styles need to be attempted and evaluated. Schools that employ unusual governance programs need to be identified and described. Thus, an effort needs to be undertaken to compare the "success" of desegregation in various settings that employ various governance systems. Finally, it would seem that researchers need to penetrate school system offices. The place to start is with descriptive surveys and ethnographic investigations that attempt to document the logics employed within centralized administrations. Without that, the research efforts at the school level may simply be naive and misguided.

It should be noted that most of the literature on administration is commentary, and not systematic research. The few quantitative studies are not very analytic and mostly describe process and procedures. The qualitative studies are more analytic, but waiver between seeing the problem as inept administration or an incorrigible institution.

ORDER AND DISCIPLINE

One of the more frequent recurring themes in current literature pertaining to desegregated education is that of order and discipline in the schools. Maintaining peace in the school, however, entails more than the matter of corporal punishment of unruly children. Instead, the literature suggests that school violence in the present context of education, involves two similar but distinguishable phenomena: 1) student mass protest over issues dealing with school or larger societal problems; and 2) individual acts of personal violence or property damage which symbolize rejection of school orientations. As Friedenburg (1971) suggests, the former type of activity indicates to educators the existence of an ideological bases while the individualistic disruption is indicative of mere mischief.

Student protest

Libarle (1969) points out many students are being denied basic rights and freedoms guaranteed under the constitution. In protest, students see the redistribution of wealth and resources as the most critical and necessary event in solving their other problems. The most critical protest issues among student populations concern racial discrimination, and secondly, the forms of discrimination leveled at all students. These protest concerns as well reflect wider community anxiety over the quality of education. As Fuchs (1961) suggests, when administrators initiate special services, they forget that assumptions about students, based upon general neighborhood background, do not necessarily concern the individual needs of the students. School programs instituted to ameliorate lower class learning deficiencies

often outrage the local community. And their anger is often incorporated into civil rights protest which may include demands for personnel changes. Furthermore, Levy (1970) in Ghetto School clearly indicates the implied undertone of violence which characterizes schools in controversy. Such an implied threat is also described in Schreck, Harper and Goroff (1975) and Rist (1972).

In schools where educational policy is resented, students perceive educators as merely attempting to maintain control rather than aiding in educational opportunity (Haney and Zimbardo 1975). School controversy over policy results when a gap exists between the actual accomplishments of curriculum plans and the expectations of students. Violence thus reflects dissatisfaction with educational process which promises the myth of social mobility but allows only an increasing concern for regularity, order and discipline (Levy, 1970). Classroom situations mirror this gap between expectations and realization, in that instructors apply teaching methods stressing compensation for the disadvantaged, and students resist such methods due to their alienation about educational outcomes (Hickerson 1966). Further characterizing such schools with alienated student populations is a cycle of violence and response to violence in which frequent incidents of violence determine administrative and teacher responses, thereby shaping the learning experiences of students, further alienating them and producing more violence (Rist 1972).

Individual mischief

Turning to forms of individualistic misbehavior from issues of mass protest in the school, it appears that vandalism and disruption are again manifestations of unequal outcomes of education for different groups

of students. In the context of classroom interaction, instructors perceive disruptive children to be, and assume that disruption is, bad and what is being disrupted is good. Unruly children must be separated for the good of the class. Quick identification and separation of disruptive students are positive attributes for teachers who desire to hold instructive classes (Redl 1975). By singling out the disruptive child into special programs and courses, the school is able to maintain order and at the same time reinforce status differentiation of those who rock the boat. Vandalism is particularly distressful to school staffs since property destruction is a direct rejection of educational efforts to socialize students about norms pertaining to patriotism, acceptance of discipline and value of consumptive property (Friedenberg 1971).

Order in schools

Strategies for the control of vandalism as suggested by Koch (1975) range from writing off the problem as insoluble to technological innovation (such as bugging) to removal of crimogenic causation through societal change. Koch claims that consideration of issues about school violence must involve balancing the claims of society as a whole versus the needs of individual students. He argues that adequate control strategies may not be discovered until all levels of control are examined, be they cultural, societal, community, familial or individual. Increasing administration intervention in problem-riddled schools reflects concern that is manifested by greater preoccupation with control.

Control in schools has been described as similar to that found in prisons. Haney and Zimbardo (1975) make analogies between principals as wardens and students as inmantes. They view schools as nearly total institutions, controlling the lives of students by determining dress,

behavior and movement during the school day. As a means of control, methods of corporal punishment or some form of exclusion are used to align student behavior with institutional guidelines. The more extreme form of exclusion is that of school suspension, and more so than whites, black students have been singled out for separation from school environment (see Bell 1972 and Clark 1972; Yudof 1975).

As Friedenberg (1971) notes, dealing with problems of school violence, disruption and protest on the part of administrators does not occur until their positions are threatened. When community involvement over controversial problems brings pressure on school principals, superintendents, and boards of education, some activity to resolve the matter will begin. Ziegler and Boss (1974) report school board members and superintendents are generally insensitive to social problems because of their rational ideology of education. In theory if not in practice, this precludes racial distinctions. Generally the civil rights movement has been mostly symbolic and has clouded the issues in school controversy. On the level of individual schools, Rist (1972), Levy (1970), Turbowitz (1971) and Fuchs (1966) suggest that principals are often caught in a crossfire between board pressure, community pressure, and faculty discontent when facing school crises. To alleviate this dilemma, Steward (1965) suggests that greater skill in crisis prevention (rather than intervention), care ful perception of community standards of education and needs, and restructuring school environments should be considered. An excellent example of constructive change with these measures is provided in a study by Schreck, Harper and Goroff (1975) which describes community-wide involvement fostered by an open, highly visible administration committed to change.

In one year, violence was decreased and differences between various student populations were aired without recourse to disruption.

Summary

As with other issue areas reviewed in this paper, there seems to be a paucity of systematic research and commentary upon order and discipline in the desegregated school. It would seem particularly important to compare the variety of administrative styles and the receptiveness of desegregated school settings to them. Also, the consequences of order and discipline procedures need more study. Some students are pushed out of school via a combination of academic failure and disciplinary procedures, and it would certainly seem this is more often the case with minority students. Along with the study of consequences, it would seem necessary to systematically investigate the dimensions of commitment of students. What is it about school that some students do not act out and others do? Some research has looked at this and argued that commitment is a function of reaping the benefits, immediate and long range, of the institution. Yet studies in interracial settings are noticeably few. Finally, the literature argues that even the principal feels powerless. Field studies and experiments need to be undertaken with the expressed aim of maximizing the power of all school participants and assessing the academic and discipline consequences.

Current literature concerning order and discipline in America's school system emphasizes the accessibility of school administrations to student overtures as directly varying with the school's milieu of controversy. The first form of literature, qualitative designs, are questioning

the very basis of American education and conclusions reached at the end of those studies appear to confirm the suspicions raised. Secondly, those studies utilizing quantitative data are divided over basic conceptual outlook but they suggest that administrators are fatalistic concerning their positions vis a vis student violence and political pressures, and that no matter who was in their position, little could be done. This sense of powerlessness with the present situation is indicative of a framework similar to those reached in qualitative designs, that structural and or social change may be ne œssary before the crises in schools is past. Finally the commentative literature is more focused upon the matter of issues in the schools, rather than schools being the issue. They suggest that administrators can effect change if significant pressure is brought to bear. Essay articles in general are more optimistic about school outcomes although much controversy and pain are seen as concomitants to successful crisis revolution.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Instructional materials

It has been argued that more than school and classrooom desegregation, compensatory educational programs and additional resource dollars will be needed if we are to reach our goal of equal opportunity and equal outcomes of education. Every child must have an equal chance to participate in the learning process, be fairly depicted in the textbooks and receive a rightful share of school resources, including time and attention from the teacher. At present there are practices within the educational system which serve to restrict some children's learning process. Allen (1968) and McLaurin (1971) found that state-approved courses and supplementary textbooks, written post 1954, being used in several southern states show an inadequate and prejudiced picture of Negroes. Texts written from 1961 on, ignored the lower-class black family, always depicting the black as a loner. In this way the informal social learning of white children about blacks is sanctioned and buttressed by formal education. Research by Caliguri and Levine (1968) with suburban educators found that very few school districts had written policies encouraging teachers to use inter-ethnic material and very little support was given to those who tried to use more and better instructional material of this type. Teachers (Caliguri 1971; Noar 1966) complained of poor quality of inter-ethnic material in social studies texts and expressed the need for more illustrations of integrated human groupings and settings and the portrayal of minority groups in a more positive light.

Tracking

Historically, the poor image of lower class and minorities are depicted in textbooks has also been the image used by schools to determine the educational experience of these children (Crimmins 1974). The educational track system (Clark 1964; Rist 1970; Schafer and Olexa 1971) discriminates against low-income minority groups by locking-in students to a particular educational or career line. These children come to school less well prepared for learning than their middle-class peers and because they have more to learn in the same period of time, teachers label them as "slow learners" (Hickerson 1966). In the third of fourth grade, students are given standardized tests which are used as the formal basis for tracking. Lower-class children are deliberately channeled into the lower track programs that offer curriculum which, in most cases, is poorly planned, academically weak, and basically uncoordinated (Eddy 1967). When children in the same classroom are placed in different tracks special adaptations are made in the regular curriculum so the lower track children undertake less work and are given more time to do it under the assumption that these children are "disadvantaged." The curriculum offering for upper track students is more advanced or supplementary to the normal instructional material which emphasizes specific kinds of knowledge and work skills.

Tracking reinforces failure for those who have done poorly in the past, both through curriculum offering and because teachers spend more time with the upper track students (Hickerson 1966; Moore 1967; Stein 1971; Clark 1965; Hodgkinson 1961; Levy 1970). Slow learners are not fooled (McCullough 1974). They know when they are being discriminated against by being given "slow work" and often balk at doing the assignment. In

so doing, they fulfill the teachers' expectations of them by failing to learn. Thus, schools succeed in inducing and perpetuating the pathology they claim to remedy.

The children do not understand to what extent their failure is institutionalized and semi-automatic, nor are they aware of the political significance (Levy 1970; Stein 1971). Income and occupation of the father are almost as good as IQ test scores in predicting whether youth will go to college. The educational system is geared to the needs of children from middle-class environments (Hodgkinson 1966). The system is structured through tests, reward systems and required behavior patterns to allow children of the middle class to do well and to filter out the poor (Carnoy 1974; Gintis 1971; Dreeben 1968). At each grade level, curriculum is "modified" to teachers' images of what children can be expected to do (Stein 1971). Moreover pupils in lower track courses are further demoralized by the widespread grading policy in high schools. Lower track students often cannot receive a grade higher than "C" or "B" no matter how hard they try, nor how completely they master the material available to them (Hickerson 1966).

As soon as the child reaches sixteen years of age, the teacher's task is lightened. The simplest way of not teaching the child is to get him out of school through the insidious "incentive or social promotion" practice (Stein 1971). As Hickerson (1966; 1973) states, "Children of deprived background who do manage to graduate from high school are seldom better off for completing this ordeal because schools have equipped them with few saleable skills" (cf., Ogbu 1974).

One of the major causes of children not being taught is that neither teachers, principals, supertindents nor Boards of Examiners who set the criteria for evaluation are accountable for the success or failure in teaching children. Educational personnel feel that their "professionalism" puts them above being accountable.

Summary

Research that looks at curriculum and instruction has not focused upon the question: how do you provide instruction for all students. Rather the literature is permeated with discourse on how to best teach the minority student. In public education today that focus is reflected in the development of separate special programs and ability grouping. The literature reviewed here is critical of tracking and special programs, but little effort has been devoted to how best to teach all students.

A second issue that is addressed in the section on consequences of interracial schooling also needs to be reinterated here. There are few studies that look at the long-range consequences of tracking and instructional techniques. Further, there is a dire need, particularly when they concern the resegregation of desegregated schools, to examine the changes made after desegregation and the logics that support those modifications, even comparative descriptions of classrooms that are desegregated and segregated as a result of whatever logic are needed. These descriptions need to focus not as much on teacher behavior, but qualitative assessments of the teachers' messages that are conveyed via his/her teaching methodology and upon how much substantive knowledge is being provided.

Generally, the literature reviewed here is critical of current curriculum and instruction procedures. There there was little

distinction in the conceptual frameworks employed in the quantitative studies, qualitative studies and commentaries.

There is some doubt as to whether the research reviewed here is representative, since it would seem that there must be considerable literature supporting tracking and special instructional approaches for minority students. It is possible that much of this literature is couched as "special education," etc., which is not reviewed in this paper. If this is true, this would indicate that there are at least two discrete themes in the literature. One assumes that special programs hinder; the other, that they help. But more importantly, the latter sees students as having deficiencies, while the former assumes education does.

Teachers and desegregation

Teachers play a critical role in determining the success or failure of desegregated education for they deal on a daily basis with problems in integration of race and class. Orfield (1975) has written that desegregation is often a traumatic experience, especially for white teachers, because they are forced to cope with their personal prejudices as well as with problems that may arise in teaching children with different backgrounds.

Thus far researchers have paid little attention to the effect of desegregation on teachers. Anderson (1958) in writing of early school desegregation in Tennessee says that teachers were at a loss as to what to do for they had received not one hour of training in race relations from the university. In their reports of results from desegregated workshops Agee and Smith (1971), Stein (1971) and Preston and Robinson (1974) say that teachers indicated a reduction in anxiety over working in a biracial situation due to the workshop experiences. Many white teachers had classical stereotypes of blacks shattered and participants evidenced a noticeable change for the better in their behavior toward each other. However, there are no follow-up studies to indicate what impact workshops make in the classroom behavior of teachers.

Teaching minorities

Middle-class teachers have traditionally discriminated against students in terms of socioeconomic class (Alsworth and Woock 1971; Hickerson 1966; Silberman 1964; Herndon 1969; Clark 1964). Children of racial and ethnic minorities are seen as lower-class so the desegregation process did not necessitate a revision in methods of classifying children--blacks were simply lumped into "lower-class" and teachers went on with "business as usual." Callahan (1962) and Kvaraceus (1971) say that schools are indeed a business operated with the expressed purpose of realizing the greatest return for the least amount of investment. Rist (1973) has portrayed the school as a "factory where children go to fail." Teachers act like job-oriented workers, leaving shortly after students in the afternoon, rather than profession-oriented educators who might use the time to search for new and better ways of teaching (Leacock 1969; Libarle and Seligson 1969). Workers in factories have been described as feeling alienated from management much as Clark (1970) describes the distance maintained by teachers in their dealings with "those children." It is argued that no effort is made to establish a humanitarian atmosphere in the classroom or to interact with students on an individual basis. Haskins (1969) in his Diary of a Harlem School Teacher says that faculty members in some desegregated schools do not speak to each other even on a professional basis. In schools where teachers do talk to each other the conversations are usually limited to the passing on of derogatory information about students (Clark 1970). Thelen (1954) argues that rather than being liberators, teachers are more often taskmasters occupied with giving out tasks set by bureaucratic supervisors. Teachers feel a lack of power and influence in determining educational matters in their schools

so teachers' unions have been formed (Alsworth and Woock 1970; Fisk 1970) in some cities to act as bargaining agents in matters of pay, due process and equal rights. When teachers express desires for gestures of appreciation from lower-class parents the parents are quick to point out that teachers receive pay and fringe benefits for their work and should not expect gratitude as well (Ogbu 1974).

The educational system from kindergarten through college has the means to sort out those who do not conform. Prospective teachers, no matter how intelligent or highly motivated, must fit into institutional frameworks and display correct ideologies as determined by key personnel in schools of education or they will not be awarded teaching credentials (Bergen 1968). Newly trained young teachers with the desire to help children are soon socialized by older teachers into traditional methods of teaching and thinking. Rist (1973), Levy (1970), McCullough (1974), Eddy (1967) and Herndon (1969) depict the most important function of the teacher as the maintaining of control. Those who do fail to do so are faced with loss of esteem in the eyes of principals and other teachers because maintaining control is seen as being synonymous with educating. As means to establish control, teachers inflict both mental and physical pain on students (Clark 1965; McCullough 1974). As a result of this atmosphere of impending violence, schools often add to the confusion they are trying to prevent. A bigoted, belligerent teacher can bring students' resentments to the boiling point resulting in war in the classroom.

One way in which teachers view their relationships with students and parents is that of patron-client (Ogbu 1974; Levy 1970; Fuchs 1969). Their purpose is to raise the students out of lower-class life and turn them into middle-class taxpayers. Teachers decide when and on what basis

they will meet with parents and though there are often conflicts (parent-teacher) about teaching and learning stereotypes, the lower-class parents seldom vocalize their objections because they need what the teachers have to offer and have little power to press their point. These parents often avoid contact with teachers because teachers "make them feel dumb." Parents are not considered qualified to make judgments about their own children. Teachers reject ideas or suggestions parents might venture as to why their children are having school-related problems or what approach might be used to help the children.

Middle-class teachers experience difficulty in identifying with different values of lower-class and/or culturally different children (Adams 1966). Rather than trying to effect cultural change, it has been argued that teachers should try to be conscious of, as well as understand and respect, cultural differences (Hillson 1967; Adams 1966; Fuchs 1969; Greene 1974;Woodworth and Salzer 1971; Anderson 1958; Prichard 1969; Orstein 1971; Wiles 1970; Alsworth and Woock 1970; Levenson 1968). Clark (1971:98) sums up this line of thought quite well when he says

> The answer to the problem is to get personnel of public schools . . . to address themselves to their responsibility, teaching children, teaching human beings. Data shows perspective, degree of literacy of teachers in understanding the nature and characteristics of human differences is no higher than that of the general public.

Teacher attitudes

The major thrust of the literature having to do with teachers is centered around judgments teachers make about students and some of the results of those judgments. The teacher establishes the social role structure of the classroom. Students perceive this role, act out the role and in so doing become locked into it. Thus, this teacher-assigned role becomes a "self-fulfilling prophecy" (Entwisle and Webster 1974) for the

child. Teachers make value judgments of children by October of the first year at school (Hickerson 1966) on the basis of extra-school factors such as race, status of parents, appearance which have nothing to do with the child's ability to learn (Rist 1972). Middle-class teachers' prejudgments that lower-class and minority children will be less successful academically than the white, middle-class child determines the entire school future of these children (Alsworth and Woock 1971; Clark 1964). The prejudices of teachers against the lower-class child (Woodworth and Salzer 1971; Eddy 1967; Clark 1965) have a direct effect on how the child learns. Wiles (1970) reports that teachers' attitudes toward pupils differ with racial and economic composition and type of school. This results in unequal distribution of educational opportunity (Hillson 1967; Moore 1964) and school rewards with lower-class children receiving the smaller share.

Summary

Unfortunately, there seems to be little study of how desegregation has affected teachers, their attitudes and classroom behavior. Even basic research addressing the relationship of teacher attitudes and actual behavior has not been systematically undertaken. It would seem significant to understand how teachers have modified their approaches to teaching, education, the sponsorship of co-curricular activities, and students in general after schools were desegregated. Another area of needed research concerns teacher relationships with administration and teacher-to-teacher relations in desegregated schools. Unionization and its meaning in desegregated school and school systems would also seem to need more study. Universally, this research needs to be comparative and utilize a variety of research methods.

The existing literature on teachers seems to be mostly commentary which sees the teachers as a problem. These works argue that better teachers, better teacher training and more resources will make teachers more responsive to minority students. The qualitative research is less optimistic and argues that while teachers need training and assistance, the major problem is in the organization of the institution. The teachers are more-or-less caught up in the institutional logic. There is little quantitative research, mostly evaluations of attempts to change teacher attitudes or counting of teacher-student interactions. The conceptual frameworks employed in the quantitative studies seem to represent both teachers as the problem and the institution as the problem analyses, without a clear tendency for either.

EXTRASCHOOL FACTORS

There is no little debate over the effect of extraschool factors upon interracial schooling. In fact, this debate would seem to be the debate that needs resolving before a uniform policy and implementation strategy on interracial education can be designed. However, it appears that few will be giving ground in their stances. The assumptions of each of these schools seem irreconcilable with those of the other. The debate seems to have centered almost exclusively on the effects of extraschool factors upon academic achievements, and the discussion here will be limited to that subject. Other extraschool factors and other dependent variables are included in other sections of this review.

The first two schools of thought, what will be called "innate ability" and "cultural deprivation," both consider extraschool factors to be primary in explaining success or failure in an academic environment. The third school of thought, which will be called "school contingencies" for lack of a better term, argues that they are not as significant as the others have proposed, if significant at all. This distinction, however, should not lead one to conclude that innate ability proponents and cultural deprivation proponents are essentially similar in outlook. While both consider extraschool factors to be significant, they do not agree on how to explain the significance of extraschool factors or to what degree proposed solutions can overcome the extraschool factors.

Innate ability

The first school of thought to be discussed, innate ability, posits that the failure of minority students to succeed in school is due to genetic deficiencies of minorities. For example, the works of Jensen (1969; 1970) and Eysenck (1971) propose that there is little that can be done to increase the academic achievement of blacks either through desegregation of schools or through remedial programs, although the latter, of course, certainly could be used to help minorities maximize the attainment of their limited potential.

Most of the works that have developed this theme have based their conclusions upon the changes or lack of enduring changes in I.Q. test scores, their measure of innate ability. While it seems impossible at this point in time to empirically demonstrate the existence or non-existence of innate differences in ability, many have taken the genetic argument to task for its use of I.Q. tests as measures of ability (Lundberg 1939; Montague 1970; Rist 1970; Husen 1972; Richardson, Spears and Richards 1972; Labov 1970; Heber 1969). These works have critiqued the genetic studies on the bases, among others, of a misuse of the concept of race, seeming ignorance of linguistics, and poor sampling techniques. While these critiques are formidable, I.Q. scores have continued to be used as indicators of genetic ability. Jencks et al. (1972) estimates, for example, that genes explain about 45 percent of the variance in test scores. Yet even in that reasoned study, there is no genetic evidence, rather just social indicators that are assumed to be reflective of hereditary differences.

The literature suggesting that innate ability accounts for the lack of successful negotiation of the process of schooling by minorities seems to lack credibility. Richards, Richardson and Spears

(1972), for example, argue that before there can be ". . . a realistic debate about individual differences in intellectual performance, we need two things--a description of intelligence and an adequate theory of its mode of development" (p. 181). This has not been forthcoming, and thus it seems that until an adequate understanding of, and means of ascertaining cognitive differences are found, it would seem best to assume, as Pearl (1970) advocates, that for both policy and research purposes, most students come into the school system relatively homogeneous in innate ability.

Cultural deprivation

There are others who also see minority students entering school with deficiencies. Yet they understand them not to be the result of genetic heritage, but rather the consequences of being raised in an environment that does not provide a child with the background necessary to achieve in school. It is argued that deficiencies in minority background such as little attention or encouragement from parents (Fraser 1959; Dave 1963; Wolf 1964), poor time orientation, perceptual deficits (Chilman 1967; Gottleib 1967), inability to reason abstractly and use of a logically inferior dialect (Bernstein 1961; Bereier and Englemann 1966), and scarcity of books and encyclopedias in the home along with parents' reading deficiencies (Fraser 1959; Coleman 1966; Gottleib 1967) are the major causes of educational underachievement among minority students. The logic of this school of thought finds support in interpreting the Coleman Report as indicating that the more significant aspect of the schooling process is, in fact, the students themselves. That is, schools that have predominantly white, middle-class

students, it is argued, will benefit minority students because the middle-class student will enrich the environment of the minority child and thus help counteract his/her "deprivation" due to cultural background (Moynihan 1968). There is some concern over whether or not cultural deprivation is primarily due to racial or social class background. However, it seems that the factors are interactive (Coleman 1966) with race being the more salient factor (Jencks 1972) in explaining achievement scores. However, social class seems to explain more variance in dropout rates, which would seem to be an indicator of school commitment. Race continues, however, to be more significant when looking only at nonwhite-collar youths (Coleman 1966).

Cultural deprivation has also received much criticism. Among the most cogent of these criticisms are the use in many of these studies of middle-class criteria for assessing deficiencies in the home life of less than middle-class students (Baratz and Baratz 1970; Ginsberg 1972); misuse of the concepts of "culture" and "deprivation" (Valentine 1968; Keddie 1973); ignorance of the linguistic structure of non-standard dialects (Labov 1970); and the use of traditional instruments and measures such as I.Q. scores in assessing alleged pre-school differences between students (Ryan 1965; Cicourel 1974). It appears that this school of thought suffers, as does the innate ability school, from a lack of theory about when differences between people constitutes deficiencies and when they are, in fact, just differences. Thus, cognitive styles vary; but the only base cultural deprivation proponents use for comparison is a somehow monolithic white, middle-class culture. They seemingly have grossly underrepresented even the heterogeniety present in the white, middle-classes.

School contingencies

The many critiques of both the innate ability and cultural deprivation themes seem to have led to the recent emergence of a new school of thought--one which has yet to evolve a recognized name for itself. However, inasmuch as this school of thought emphasizes not extraschool factors but the contingencies that the institution of formal education creates for the heterogeneous mass that is processed each year in the name of teaching and learning, an appropriate name may be "school contingencies." The origins of the school of thought seems to have been with the "labeling perspective" that came into vogue in the 1960's. (cf. Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968; Cicourel and Kitsuse 1963; Schafer and Olexa 1971; Friedenberg 1965; Henry 1963) and the emergence of black critiques of the educational process (cf. Clark, 1964, 1965) These works argued that success in school is dramatically affected by the organization of learning experience. Major emphasis has been placed on the effects of ability grouping and tracking (Rosenbaum 1975; Rist 1973; Henry 1963) the social class context of the school (Wilson 1969; Coleman 1966), and the quality of teachers and facilities (Coleman 1966).

Critics, however, argue that this perspective is naive and does not take into account the special needs of minority youth (Jensen 1971). It appears that systematic criticism has been abated, since few critiques are found in the literature, by a series of historical analyses (Katz 1971; Karier, Vidas and Spring 1973; Greer, 1972; Tyack 1974) that demonstrated that public schooling was not intended to be a mobility device for the poor, but rather a means of training the masses while maintaining social stratification.

Thus, a charge that might be leveled by proponents of the cultural deprivation perspective that students need school skills and attitudes in order to experience social mobility was neutralized.

This emerging perspective is arguing traditional analyses that have found family background to be more relevant to school success than school characteristics have misconceptualized the character of the institution. Instead of being a passive agent that simply accepts the raw material in the form of students and does what it can, this school of thought sees the school as an avid actor that makes assumptions and acts upon them. Race and social class are important in this school of thought only because the school assumes they are and is organized to act upon that assumption.

Summary

There can be little synthesis of the research concerning the role of extraschool factors in promoting or denying academic success at this point in time. The perspectives are simply too divergent in assumptions for this to occur until the assumptions themselves are rigorously tested. It seems that considerable emphasis for new research and thought needs to be put upon innovative, but rigorous, attempts at developing theories and descriptions of intelligence. This is long overdue. Further, research needs to be conducted with the goal of ascertaining how it is that social class and schooling interact. The more ethnographic works seem to have been helpful in defining the school as an actor, but quantitative studies need to be undertaken that conceptualize the interaction in less deterministic ways. This would allow for an analysis of the relevance of school contingencies to student performance.

A second gap in the literature seems to be a lack of field studies and experiments that begin to specify when differences do seem to be deficiencies, if ever, and under what conditions are deficiencies responsive to remediation. Particular emphasis should be placed upon cataloging cognitive styles of students and school personnel with a direct charge to look at the variety of styles that individual school participants use in everyday life. Thus, it may be discernible when a student is truly lacking in some skills and when a student is portraying a cognitive style as a response to a setting (Cicourel et al. 1974).

Thirdly, qualitative assessments are needed of the effect of local neighborhood economics upon the quality of education. If an economically depressed area suddenly experiences a surge in employment, what is the effect upon school processes, student outlook and actions, teacher attitudes and actions, and parental involvement?

In surveying the distribution of literature according to the three major themes, there does seem to be a relationship between the type of research conducted and the conceptual framework used in explaining the role of extraschool factors. While none of the conceptual frameworks utilized only one type of research methodology, it appears that more quantitative approaches lend themselves to the innate ability and cultural deprivation perspectives, even though a significant body of this literature is simply descriptive commentary. The school contingencies perspective tended to use more qualitative methodologies, both historical and observational.

CONSEQUENCES FOR STUDENTS

The predicted consequences of interracial schooling is a part of the debate over the role of extra-school factors in school success. The concern over the effect of the mixing of races in the public school for the children is seemingly a major issue deserving of a separate discussion. The consequences to be discussed here concern four issues: academic achievement, self-confidence, racial prejudice, and career consequences. The discussion of the first three will rely heavily upon St. John's (1975) review of quantitative studies, and will be done in two sections--one reviews her conclusions across all three issues, and the second discusses the qualitative research and commentary frameworks used to explain the three issues. The last issue, career consequences, will review a small amount of literature that attempts to document the consequences of interracial schooling for entrance into the world of work.

St. John's review

Academic achievement. The Coleman report (1966) reported one finding that has been the basis of much of the reasoning behind federally mandated desegregation of schools. Particularly, the report argued that the academic achievement of black students is higher in desegregated schools. The attempts at replicating this finding are many. Yet, St. John (1975) in her review of quantitative studies that address this issue, ends up arguing that adequate data have not yet been gathered to determine if there exists a causal relationship between the

racial composition of a school and the academic achievement of the students. However, she highlights some trends. First, ". . . desegregation has rarely lowered academic achievement for either black or white children" (p. 36). Second, city size or region does not seem to affect the influence (or lack of systematic influence) of desegregation on achievement. Third, it appears that kindergarten age children reap more academic achievement benefits than do older children. Fourth, gains, when observed, are more usual in mathematical than in verbal achievement. Fifth, the method of desegregation, i.e., busing, "natural," redistricting, etc., does not seem to determine whether or not gains in academic achievement are to be forthcoming, although this last matter has had little systematic study.

Self-confidence. St. John (1975) reviews three commonly studied psychological outcomes of interracial education: anxiety, self-concept, and aspirations. For anxiety a common finding is that black children have a generally higher anxiety level than whites, but placement in an interracial education setting does not seem to increase the level of anxiety.

Rosenberg and Simmons (1971) also argue that there is essentially no difference by race in the self-esteem of youth. St. John's review argues that there is little evidence that points to a rise in self-esteem among blacks that results from the desegregation of schools. The evidence also suggests that the self images of girls and lower class youth are more vulnerable in interracial schools, desegregated faculties help raise self-concept, and that controversy over desegregation may raise black self-esteem because of the high

morale of the black community that engages in such controversy. All in all, however, in the short-run school desegregation seems to have more of a negative or mixed than positive effect upon academic self-concept and more generalized self-esteem. Sense of control, however, is never negatively related to the white percentage of the school. Further, in the long-run, St. John argues, desegregation in education is related to higher self-esteem.

Similar to the pattern of findings with self-esteem, it appears that quantitative studies reveal that blacks and whites have similar levels of aspirations, and that blacks in segregated schools have higher aspirations than whites. "For both educational and occupational aspirations, the relation with school percentage white tends to be negative" (St. John 1975: p. 59).

Racial prejudice. Maybe more than with the other two consequences of interracial schooling discussed, academic achievement and self-confidence, there are few systematic findings concerning the effects of interracial education upon racial relations. St. John argues, however, that desegregation does seem more beneficial to black children if racial attitudes rather than friendship is the criterion. Further, experiments, more than other quantitative research designs, are more likely to show increasing racism in white attitudes. Again younger children benefit more than older children and hostile school or community environments may account for negative results.

Other research

The studies that St. John reviews, however, fail to answer some crucial questions. St. John notes:

> Researchers have not controlled such variables as the levels of community controversy over desegregation, the friendliness of white parents and students, the flexibility or prejudice of the staff, the content of the curriculum, or the method of teaching (p. 39);

and,

> One issue that has not been resolved is whether "realism" is an important dimension of aspiration and self-concept. Are these attitudes functional only if they are in line with the abilities of individuals and with opportunities in the social structure (p. 59);

and,

> This review of research on racial attitudes and behavior in schools indicates that desegregation sometimes reduces prejudice and promotes interracial friendship and sometimes promotes, instead, stereotyping and interracial cleavage and conflict. An outcome so variable must be affected by circumstances other than the mere fact of desegregation (p. 85).

These concerns have been addressed, but not in an extensive series of research projects such as those St. John has reviewed. Rather these are questions that more qualitative studies have reflected upon. Not only have they critiqued many of the "objective" quantitative measures of the dependent variables, but they have also pointed to the importance of understanding that these quantitative measures are designed in each case to approximate an essentially qualitative variable. Further, a number of commentators, cf. Pearl (1972), Katz (1964) and Pettigrew (1975) have found this quantitatively dominated segment of research to be missing the definition of the situation in terms of such things as pluralistic or assimilative logics of integration (Rist 1975). Further, it appears that both commentators and qualitative researchers are likely to look at behaviors and attitudes as occuring in a specific context. Thus, the works of Levy (1970), Rist (1973), Schrag (1967) and Holt (1967; 1969) all seem to point to the notion that academic achievement, self-confidence and racial attitudes of students in a desegregated educational setting are, at least in part, a function of school processes. The school's

response to the presence of a minority youth is a major factor in what and how much students learn, the self-confidence and academic self-concept they portray, and the racial attitudes and friendship choices of students. A school that has within the class room ability grouping and/or curriculum tracks not only limits the information they receive, the confidence that can be portrayed "realistically," and with whom one will associate. Intriguingly, St. John in her discussion that follows the review of quantitative studies and thus allows more qualitative assessments ends up in this school of thought, which a naive reader could not have predicted from her introduction and the substance of her literature review.

Career consequences

It is true that research on desegregated education is only about twenty years old. Yet even taking this into account, there are few studies that have attempted to assess the career consequences of youth coming from a desegregated school. This would seem to be especially needed due to the arguments by some whites that the quality of education is suffering after desegregation. Yet, St. John could only find one study that traced interracial schooling even into college entrance. Perry (1973) found that black students from a desegregated school program were much more likely to attend college and to attend more selective colleges than were a matched sample that attended segregated ghetto schools.

There is little denial in the literature that blacks do less well in gaining entrance to higher education or into the primary labor market. Duncan (1968) has pointed out that a black must replicate social class each generation while a white is more likely to "inherit" the social

class of parents. Yet Duncan discounts the effects of quality of education as a significant factor based on his understanding of the Coleman Report (1966) that quality of education does not vary by segregated-desegregated schooling as much as has been thought, and his argument that the quantitative measures actually are correlative with assessments of quality. Harrison (1972), from more critical perspective, agrees with Duncan, and argues that the variable is not inferior education but the infatuation of employers with credentials. His evidence demonstrates that non-whites fair worse than whites in terms of returns for years of education.

No qualitative research was found on this subject, while some commentary has argued that the mobility of blacks is contingent upon increased education. However, Duncan's and Harrison's work point to a falacy in this logic. Merely increasing education will not equalize blacks and whites. Efforts still need to be directed towards the economy. Yet, it appears that the role of education has not been fully resolved. The qualitative studies cited before have pointed to different educational experiences for blacks and whites, but no attempt has been made to continue ethnographies into the world of work from the school. Second, there seems to have been no research that compares the career consequences of the students in desegregated versus segregated schools, and under the variety of conditions that surround the segregation and desegregation. Lastly, little research has attempted to pinpoint how effective restructuring education may be as a mechanism to promote economic reform.

Summary

It appears that any synthesis of the existing literature on the consequences of interracial schooling would have to plead for more

research. The review presented here seems to call for more research that uses ethnographic techniques as St. John (1975) suggests, to understand the definition of the situation according to the participants, and attempts to lead to the development of new indicators for quantitative studies. At the very least, studies need to utilize a variety of methods to attempt to triangulation of observed results. Further, the career consequences of interracial education need comparative and experimental study. Qualitative research also needs to be undertaken to assess how education translates into entry to the world of work. That linkage seems crucial to the whole discussion of interracial education, but has not been systematically studied.

An analysis that began with discussion of extraschool factors seems reified in this issue are of consequences of interracial schooling. It seems that quantitative research and qualitative research are associated with different conceptual frameworks. Commentators are split, but seem to tend to go along with the quantitative research and argue that the consequences have to do with the characteristics of the students, while schools are seen as relatively passive processors of the raw material with which it is presented.

Qualitative researchers are not as willing to assume such a benign role for education. They emphasize that the school's responses of the presence of minority students is a critical factor in determining the educational, attitudinal and career consequences of those it serves.

SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Needed research

The literature on interracial schooling seems to have one particularly salient factor--a lack of theory. St. John (1975) commented on this when looking at the quantitative outcomes of desegregation for children. Yet is is not just limited to that portion of the literature. Most of the literature on interracial schooling is policy or procedure oriented. It is "action" research without a good grounding in social theory.

This is not to say that the literature does not have some variety in conceptual frameworks, for it does. However, the research all too often does not emerge from theory or directly inform theory. Rather the conceptual frameworks overarch the research procedures, questions and interpretations and may only become evident through a close examination of the wording of the conclusions. The authors, for some reason, have not felt free to elaborate their theoretical frameworks within the context of their research. Hopefully, the development of new theory will help explain the inconclusiveness of the findings reviewed in this paper and elsewhere. St. John's (1975) attempt at theory development seems to have been a rewarding venture. More such attempts are needed.

It also seems that there is a noticeable lack of field studies that incorporate a variety of research methodologies, qualitative and quantitative. It would seem that these types of studies enable not only

more generalizable results, but also results that are more closely attuned to schooling processes. These studies should certainly be comparative whenever possible.

A third area of needed research is within the classroom. As St. John (1975) notes:

> . . . far more illuminating (than quantitative studies) would be small scale studies involving anthropological observations of the process of interracial schooling, across settings diverse in black/white ratios and in middle-class/lower-class ratios, and also diverse in their educational philosophies and techniques. (pp. 122-123).

The argument is for more holistic assessments of the educational milieu that are almost by definition qualitative. After theoretically informed studies of this type, it may be possible to develop meaningful indicators for more quantitative approaches.

Another gap in the literature is the simple paucity of work on co-curricular activity. Winecoff and Kelly (1971), Petroni, Hirsch and Petroni (1970), Libarle and Seligon (1970), and St. John (1975) have indicated that desegregation of co-curricular activities may be a very touchy problem. Winecoff and Kelly (1971) comment that the more informal and social the co-curricular activity, the more difficult it may be for whites to accept. Petroni, Hirsch and Petroni (1970) and Libarle and Seligson (1970) concur when they note that one of the complaints by black students is a lack of black cheerleaders, one of Winecoff and Kelly's co-curricular activities that for whites is unacceptable to integrate. St. John (1975) argues that the social threat of desegregation is greater for black females than black males, since feminine beauty is judged by standards of white society and since black males may gain acceptance and self-confidence through

athletics. However, there certainly is a need to establish the theoretical and strategic significance of co-curricular activities to the process of interracial education. Research needs to be directed, first, at qualitative understanding of the importance of co-curricular activities to the students, black and white. Following these types of investigations, an effort should be made to quantify the desegregation of co-curricular activities under a variety of school and community conditions.

More specific gaps in the literature has been noted in the summary of each section of this literature review. However, let us highlight a few of them. First, for the legal/political issue there would seem to be a need for research that documents and explains what judges and attorneys who have been involved in school desegregation cases consider credible evidence and the parameters used to assess the viability of the possible remedies. Second, research on community concerns and influence is lacking that investigates the perspectives of a variety of black communities concerning desegregation and interracial education. Hopefully, some clarity of issues will emerge from knowing the effect of new political and economic power upon the perspectives of black communities. Studies are also needed of the effect of alternative governance systems, and not just variations in administrative style, upon the process of interracial education. It also appears that research on administration needs to put emphasis upon the school system administration, particularly since desegregation may lead to more centralization of decision-making. Examination is also needed of the consequences of "law and order" in the school for students. One such consequence may well be a lack of commitment to the school by students.

The essential question in need of investigation is: Under which system(s), procedure(s), and/or conditions of order and discipline will students remain committed to the school?

Research efforts need directed at the most productive means by which to teach all students, regardless of background, within the classroom and the school. The special emphasis on the minority child may be counter productive to this effort. Documentation and analysis is also needed of curricular changes, and the consequences thereof, made in response to desegregation.

One area of the effects of desegregation that has been relatively ignored is the consequences for the teachers. How has desegregation affected teachers' attitudes, classroom behavior, teacher to teacher relations, and teacher-administration relations?

The most pressing need in the issue areas of extraschool factors and consequences of interracial schooling is for the development of theories and descriptions of intelligence. This may well be a futile effort, since intelligence may be only a human construct that indicates misunderstanding of other human beings. Yet the attempts need to be made. Along with this effort, or possibly in place of it, research is critically needed in the area of career consequences of schooling, and interracial schooling in particular. The most damaging consequence of desegregation may be that employers and higher education may assume without any evidence that students from desegregated schools are less qualified, and may systematically discriminate against them. Of course, the quality of a school may decline after desegregation, but if it does it would seem to be in large part due to school response to desegregation, and may not be due to the influx of minority students.

The relationship of conceptual framework and research methodology

One of the major purposes of this literature review was to examine if there seems to be an association between research methodology and conceptual framework. Three research approaches were identified: commentary, qualitative research, and quantitative research. It should be noted that in the field of education it often seems that what authors consider qualitative research appears instead to be informed commentary. However, it was decided that how the author treated his material would be the decision rule and not someone else's assessment for this investigation.

There seems to be essentially two types of conceptual frameworks that were represented within the literature. While this may appear to be an over-reduction of literature, the lack of expressed theory in the literature on the process of interracial education simply does not seem to comfortably permit finer distinctions. One of these frameworks is highly critical of the entire institution of public education as it is currently constituted. The second conceptual framework is less critical of the institution as it assumes that problems emerge either from the inadequacies of the participants--administrators, teachers, students, parents--or from technical difficulties in implementation.

It appears that there is a relationship between research methodology and conceptual framework. As one might expect commentary is difficult to associate with one of the two conceptual frameworks. Commentary relies upon other literature, and upon the authors' predilections, to synthesize an argument. Either conceptual framework can be employed.

It appears that quantitative research is more usually associated with the conceptual framework that assumes that school problems are attributable to factors outside the control of the school (i.e., inadequacies of participants) or to technical difficulties (e.g., need for more race relations training for teachers). Qualitative research, conversely, seems overall to be more critical of the institution as it exists within society.

One source of evidence for this conclusion is the pattern of research and framework used in the various issue areas. For example, it seems that for the legal/political literature and the community concerns literature qualitative research was primarily used and the framework is critical of this institution. For the legal/political, it appears that the conclusiveness of quantitative studies have left judges and researchers alike to rely on more qualitative, historical and legal, assessments. Further, it appears that generally only those researchers that are critical of the institution are significantly concerned with community conflict, factionalism, decision-making, and the role of elites in interracial school processes. Those who are not critical of the institution simply do not seem to ask questions about the community, except in terms of the deficiencies of its inhabitants and/or the technical problems they create for the school.

Similarly, some support for the relationship between research methodology and conceptual framework is found in the literature on school administration. While difficult to be certain, it may well be that many authors became critical of the institution as their research progressed. Many seemed initially concerned with administrators and administrative styles as the problem. Yet they ended up finding the

school principal feeling powerless. Their resolution of this finding seems much more critical of the institution of education.

The hypothesis is supported in the reviews of findings of the other issue areas. Taking extraschool factors as an example, quantitative research is more likely to assume individual differences in students to be deficiencies, while qualitative research argues that they are only differences that schools could build upon if the schools were correctly organized and incorporated a different philosophy. This pattern seems consistent to those in the other issue areas.

There seems to be an underlying factor that may account for this pattern. Since there is little in the way of systematic theory about the process of interracial education, it cannot be easily argued that certain types of theory demand certain types of research methodology. However, there does seem to be a relationship between conceptual framework and research methodology that must be attributable to something. The only discernible factor that seems to be consistent with the literature herein reviewed has to do with philosophy of science that guides the endeavor research and explanation. This "third variable" may well be the degree to which the researcher relies upon a positivistic philosophy of science. The more quantitative studies use conceptual frameworks that assume that physiological and/or social forces in large part determine how a person acts, and that these forces are somehow independent of the institution of education. In fact, a usual argument is that the function of school is to deterministically socialize youth into more "acceptable" behavior and mold them for life. The more qualitative studies seem to assume that individuals are acting as

freely as possible within the constraints placed upon them by the social institution of education and the specific processes of interracial education.

It would seem to be significant to those who do research, use research findings, or fund research to begin to assess the philosophy of science that is embraced by the researcher. For this may well explain not only the choice of methodology but also the interpretation placed upon the data.

It should be remembered, however, that these findings are tentative, and in need of further exploration. The intent of this literature review was to synthesize a mass, albeit not an exhaustive mass, of literature into a format that hopefully will be useful to a wide range of lay persons, educators, and researchers, while at the same time attempting to tentatively explore and explain any relationship that could be found between conceptual framework and research methodology in the literature reviewed. Hopefully, this has been attained, and will help stimulate future thought and research concerning the processes of interracial education.

REFERENCES CITED

Abney, Everett E.
1974 The Status of Florida's Black School Principals. Journal of Negro Education 43:2-8.

Agee, W. Hugh
1974 Modifying Teachers' Attitudes Towards Speakers of Divergent Dialects Through Inservice Training. Journal of Negro Education 43:82-90.

Agee, W. Hugh, and William L. Smith
1974 Modifying Teachers' Attitudes Towards Speakers of Divergent Dialects Through Inservice Training. Journal of Negro Education 43:82-90.

Allen, Van S.
1971 An Analysis of Textbooks Relative to the Treatment of Black Americans. Journal of Negro Education 40:140-145.

Alsworth, Philip L., and Roger R. Woock
1970 Ocean Hill-Brownsville Urban Conflict and the Schools. Urban Education 4:25-40.

Anderson, B. D.
1973 School Bureaucratization and Alienation from High School. Sociology of Education 46:315-334.

Anderson, Margaret
1958 Children of the South. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Arciniega, Thomas A.
1971 Adaptive Mechanisms Employed by Bicultural Students in Urban Secondary Schools. Urban Education 6:233-241.

Armor, David J.
1972 The Evidence of Busing. The Public Interest 28:90-126.

Bagwell, William
1972 School Desegregation in the Carolinas: Two Case Studies. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Bailey, Stephen K.
1971 Disruption in Urban Pulic Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Baratz, Stephen S., And Joan C.
1970 Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism. Harvard Educational Review 40:29-50.

Batten, James K.
1970 Politics and Administrative Action. In School Desegregation Retrospect and Prospect. Dr. Eugene C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation. pp. 42-50.

Bell, Derrick A., Jr.
1975 Waiting on the Promise of Brown. Law and Contemporary Problems, Part II (Spring):341-373.

Bell, John A.
1972 Race and School Suspensions in Dallas. Integrated Education 11: 66-67.

Bentley, Robert J.
1971 The Challenge of Pluralism. Journal of Negro Education 40: 337-341.

Bereiter, C., and S. Englemann
1966 Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Pre-School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bergen, Jane
1968 Robots in the Classroom: A Look at the American Educational Factory. Wolfe City, Texas: Henington Publishing Co.

Berlowitz, Marvin J.
1974 Institutional Racism and School Staffing in an Urban Area. Journal of Negro Education 43:25-29.

Bernstein, B.
1961 Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning. In Education, Economy, and Society. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson, Eds. New York: Free Press. pp. 288-314.

Beverly, Sherman, Jr.
1975 Comments on "Educational Policy, Community Participation, and Race," A Paper by W. M. Phillips, Jr. Journal of Negro Education 44:268-270.

Bolner, James, and Arnold Vedlitz
1971 The Affinity of Negro Pupils for Segregated Schools: Obstacle to Desegregation. Journal of Negro Education 40:313-321.

Bonacich, Edna, and Robert F. Goodman
1972 Deadlock in School Desegregation: A Case Study of Inglewood, California. New York: Praeger.

Boney, J. Don, Charleta Dunn and Thomas Bass
1971 An Analysis of the Participation of Racially Integrated Guidance Groups of Culturally Different Children in Elementary School. Journal of Negro Education 40:390-393.

Bouma, Donald H., and James Hoffman
1968 The Dynamics of School Integration: Problems and Approaches in a Northern City. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Boykin, Arsene O.
1973 School Facts Support Racial Fears. Urban Education 8:271-276.

Brown, James C., Thomas A. Starnes and J. Allen Watson
1971 Southern Negro and White Educators: A Comparison of Pertinent Characteristics. Journal of Negro Education 40:159-161.

Burbach, Harold J. and Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr.
1974 Dimensions of Powerlessness Among Black and White High School Students. Journal of Negro Education 43:419-428.

Caliguri, Joseph P., and Daniel U. Levine
1968 A Study of the Use of Inter-Ethnic Materials in Suburban Schools in a Major Metropolitan Area. Phylon 31:220-230.

1971 Teacher Bias in the Selection of Social Studies Textbooks. Journal of Negro Education 40:322-329.

Callahan, Raymond E.
1965 Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carnoy, Martin
1974 Education in Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.

Carter, Donald E., Carol A. Little and Arreed F. Barabasz
1972 Comparative Study of Negro and White Attitudes Associated with Educational-Occupational Aspirations. Journal of Negro Education 41:361-364.

Cataldo, Everett F., Micheal Giles and Douglas S. Gatlin
1975 Metropolitan School Desegregation: Practical Remedy or Impractical Ideal? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 422:97-104.

Chilman, Katherine
1967 Growing Up Poor. Washington, D.C.: Welfare Administration Publication No. 13, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Chisolm, Shirley
1975 Desegregation and National Policy. Integrated Education 13: 122-126.

Cicourel, Aaron V., and John I. Kitsuse
1963 The Educational Decision-Makers. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Cicourel, Aaron, et al.
1974 Language Use and School Performance. New York: Academic Press.

Clark, Donald H., Arlene Goldsmith and Clementine Pugh
1970 Those Children. Belmont, California: Wordsworth Publishing Co.

Clark, Kenneth B.
1964 Class of Cultures in the Classroom. In Integrated Education--Learning Together. Meyer Weinberg, Ed. Chicago: Integrated Education Association. pp. 18-25.

1965 Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row.

1971 Education in the Ghetto: A Human Concern. In Urban Education in the 1970's. A. Harry Passow, Ed. Teachers College, Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Clarke, Lillian W.
1973 Race and Suspensions in New Orleans. Integrated Education 11: 30-33.

Clignet, Remi
1974 Liberty and Equality in the Educational Process. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Coffin, Brenda S., Siegfried C. Dietz and Charles L. Thompson
1971 Academic Achievement in a Poverty High School: Implications for Counseling. Journal of Negro Education 40:365-368.

Cohen, David K.
1968 School Resources and Racial Equality. Education and Urban Society 1:121-137.

Cohen, Ronald D.
1974 Urban Schooling in Twentieth-Century America A Frame of Reference. Urban Education 8:428-437.

Coleman, James S.
1976 Liberty and Equality in School Desegregation. Social Policy 6: 9-13.

Coleman, James S., et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Conant, James B.
1961 Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cottle, Thomas J.
1970 Simple Words, Simple Deeds. Urban Education 5:295-304.

1975 A March on Desegregation. Urban Education 10:115-129.

1975 Out of Work, Out of School. Urban Education 9:400-413.

Crain, Robert L.
1968 The Politics of School Desegregation. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Craven, J. Braxton
1970 Through a Looking Glass: The Constitutional Imperative. In School Desegregation. E. C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: SNPA Foundation Seminar Books.

Crimmins, Timothy J.
1974 The Crystal Stair: Study of the Effects of Caste and Class on Secondary Education in Late-Nineteenth Century Atlanta, Georgia. Urban Education 8:401-420.

Cuban, Larry
1974 Reform by Fiat: The Clark Plan in Washington, 1970-1972. Urban Education 9:8-34.

Dave, Ralph H.
1963 The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to Educational Achievement. University of Chicago: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Defleur, Lois B., and Ben A. Menke
1975 Learning About the Labor Force: Occupational Knowledge Among High School Males. Sociology of Education 48:324-345.

Dreeben, Robert
1968 On What is Learned in School. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Duncan, Otis Dudley
1969 Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race? In On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences. Daniel P. Moynihan, Ed. New York: Basic Books. pp. 85-110.

Eddy, Elizabeth M.
1967 Walk the White Line. New York: Praeger.

1975 Educational Innovation and Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment. Human Organization 34:163-172.

Efthim, Helen
1971 Pontiac Desegregation: Myth and Reality. Urban Review 8:2: 155-159.

Egerton, John
1973 Promise of Progress: Memphis School Desegregation, 1972-1973. Atlanta: Southern Regional Council.

Entwisle, Doris R., and Murray Webster, Jr.
1974 Expectations in Mixed Racial Groups. Sociology of Education 47: 301-318.

Epps, Edgar G.
1975 Educational Policy-Making: Implications for Urban Schools. Journal of Negro Education 44:309-315.

Eysenck, H. J.
1971 Race, Intelligence and Education. London: Maurice Temple Smith, Ltd.

Falk, William W., and Arthur G. Cosby
1975 The Impact of Desegregation on Rural Students. Integrated Education 14:38-40.

Fantini, Mario D.
1972 Control and Quality Education. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 46-67.

Finn, Jeremy D., Eugene L. Gaier, Samuel S. Peng and Ronald E. Banks
1975 Teacher Expectations and Pupil Achievement A Naturalistic Study. Urban Education 10:175-197.

Fish, Kenneth L.
1970 Conflict and Dissent in High Schools. New York: Bruce Publishing Co.

Foster, G. W.
1973 Desegregating Urban Schools. Harvard Educational Review 43:5-36.

Fraser, Elizabeth
1959 Home Environment and the School. London: University of London Press, Ltd.

Freire, Paulo
1973 Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

Frerichs, Allen H.
1971 Relationship of Self-Esteem of the Disadvantaged to School Success. Journal of Negro Education 40:117-120.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z.
1965 Coming of Age in America. New York: Random House.

1971 The High School as a Focus of 'Student Unrest.' Annals of Political and Social Science 395:117-127.

Fuchs, Estelle
1966 Pickets at the Gates. New York: The Free Press.

1969 Teachers Talk. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Gentry, Joe E.
1974 Organizational Training for Improving Race Relations in Schools. Education and Urban Society 6:269-284.

Giles, Herman Harry
1959 The Integrated Classroom. New York: Basic Books.

Giles, Micheal W.
1975 Black Concentration and School District Size as Predictors of School Segregation: The Impact of Federal Enforcement. Sociology of Education 48:411-420.

Gillin, John
1955 The School in the Context of the Community. In Introduction to Education: A Comparative Analysis. Donald K. Adams, Ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. pp. 383-392.

Ginzberg, Eli
1960 Segregation and Manpower Waste. Phylon 21:311-316.

Ginsberg, Herbert
1972 The Myth of the Deprived Child. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gintis, Herb
1971 Education and the Characteristics of Worker Productivity. American Economic Review 61:266-279.

Gittell, Marilyn
1968 Urban School Reform in the 1970's. Education and Urban Society 1:9-19.

Glasser, Ira
1969 The Burden of Blame: A Report on the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School Controversy. Urban Education 4:7-23.

Goldman, Harvey, and Richard Larson
1971 When Inner-City Teachers are Given "Free" Time. Journal of Negro Education 40:4-11.

Goldsborough, Harriett
1971 The Man in the Middle: How the Urban Secondary School Principal Sees His Role and Responsibilities. Canadian Education Association. ED 077 071.

Goodman, Paul
1972 Freedom and Learning: The Need for Choice. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 137-146.

Goodstein, H. A.
1971 The Use of Structured Curriculum with Black Preschool Dis-Advantaged Children. Journal of Negro Education 40:330-336.

Gordon, Margaret S.
1974 Introduction. In Higher Education and the Labor Market. Margaret S. Gordon, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 1-26.

Gottleib, David
1967 Understanding Children of Poverty. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Grady, Mary L.
1971 An Assessment of Teachers; Attitudes Toward Disadvantaged Children. Journal of Negro Education 40:146-152.

Grauband, Allen
1972 Free the Children. New York: Pantheon.

Greene, John W.
1974 On Rapping with the Inner-City School Dude. Journal of Negro Education 43:310-317.

Greer, Colin
1969 Immigrants, Negroes, and the Public Schools. Urban Review 3: 9-12.

1972 The Great School Legend. New York: Basic Books.

Hamilton, Charles V.
1968 Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy. Harvard Educational Review 38:669-684.

Haney, Craig, and Philip G. Zimbardo
1975 Blackboard Penitentiary-It's Tough to Tell a High School From a Prison. In Psychology Today 9:26-30, 106.

Hanushek, Eric A.
1972 Education and Race: An Analysis of the Educational Production Process. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Harrison, Bennett
1972 Education, Training, and the Urban Ghetto. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Haskins, Jim
1969 Diary of a Harlem Schoolteacher. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Heber, R.
1969 Milwaukee Sentinel, June 11.

Heller, Robert W.
1969 The Coleman Report Revisited. Urban Education 4:41-54.

Henry, J.
1963 Culture Against Man. New York: Random House, Inc.

Herndon, James
1968 The Way It Spozed to Be. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Hickerson, Nathaniel
1966 Education for Alienation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hillson, Maurie
1967 The Reorganization of the School: Bringing about a Remission in the Problems Faced by Minority Children. Phylon 28:230-245.

Hines, Carl R.
1970 Implementing Desegregation: Louisville, Kentucky. In School Desegregation Retrospect and Prospect. Dr. Eugene C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation. pp. 104-120.

Hodgkinson, Harold
1961 Education in Social and Cultural Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1967 Education, Interaction and Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Holden, Anna
1974 The Bus Stops Here. New York: Agathon Press.

Holt, John Caldwell
1967 How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing Co.

1969 The Under Achieving School. New York: Dell Publishing Co.

Hunt, Martin H.
1976 Parents-Teachers Alliance: An Alternative to Community Control. Integrateducation 14:35-37.

Husen, Torsten
1972 Social Background and Educational Career. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Illich, Ivan
1972 The Alternative to Schooling. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 275-277.

Jencks, Christopher, et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Jensen, Arthur R.
1969 How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Harvard Educational Review 39:1-123.

1970 Do Schools Cheat Minority Children? Educational Research 14: 3-28.

Jones, Leon
1974 Desegregation and Social Reform Since 1954. Journal of Negro Education 43:155-171.

Johnson, Willie
1971 Willie Johnson is Standing Firm. Integrated Education 9:4-11.

Karier, Clarence, Paul Vidas and Joel Spring
1973 Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Katz, Irwin
1964 Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes. American Psychologist 19: 381-399.

Katz, Micheal
1971 Class, Bureaucracy and Schools. New York: Praeger. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, Expanded Edition. New York: Praeger.

Kearney, Annette G., and Robert L. Clayton
1973 Career Opportunity for Blacks: Trick or Treat? School Counselor 21:102-108.

Keddie, Nell (ed.)
1973 The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc.

Kirp, David L.
1968 The Poor, the Schools, and Equal Protection. Harvard Educational Review 38:635-684.

Koch, E. L.
1975 School Vandalism and Strategies of Social Control. Urban Education 10:54-71.

Kvaraceus, William C.
1971 Fantasies in a Place Called "School." In Reactions to Silberman's Crisis in the Classroom. A. Harry Passow, Ed. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co. pp. 66-77.

Labov, William
1970 The Logic of Non-Standard English. In The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Nell Keddie, Ed. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books. pp. 21-67.

La Porte, Robert, Jr., Jerome Becker and Charles V. Willie
1965 The Evolution of Public Educational Policy: School Desegregation in a Northern City. Urban Education 2:150-162.

Larkin, Ralph W.
1975 Social Exchange in the Elementary School Classroom: The Problem of Teacher Legitimation of Social Power. Sociology of Education 48: 400-410.

Leacock, Eleanor Burke
1969 Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. New York: Basic Books.

Leesinger, Leon M.
1971 Educational Engineering: Managing Change to Secure Stipulated Results for Disadvantaged Children. Journal of Negro Education 40: 277-281.

Levenson, William B.
1968 The Spiral Pendulum. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Levine, Daniel U.
1972 Concepts of Bureaucracy in Urban School Reform. In Urban Education, (Revised Edition). Richard R. Heidenreich, Ed. Arlington, Virginia: College Readings, Inc. pp. 335-343.

1972 Stratification, Segregation, and Children in the Inner-City School. Richard R. Heidenreich, Ed. Arlington, Virginia: College Readings, Inc. pp. 237-245.

Levy, Gerald E.
1970 Ghetto School. New York: Pegasus Western Publishing Co.

Libarle, Marc, and Tom Seligson (Eds.)
1970 The High School Revolutionaries. New York: Random House.

Lincoln, C. Eric
1960 Anxiety, Fear, and Integration. Phylon 21:278-285.

Lundberg, George A.
1939 Foundations of Sociology. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Mackler, Bernard
1969 The Theatre of the Absurd: The New York City Public Schools. Urban Education 4:310-332.

Marascuilo, Leonard A., and F. Dagenais
1974 The Meaning of the Word "Integration" in a Multi-Racial High School. Journal of Negro Education 43:178-189.

McCormick, Marijo K., and Juanita H. Williams
1974 Effects of a Compensatory Program on Self-Report, Achievement and Aspiration Level of "Disadvantaged" High School Students. Journal of Negro Education 43:47-52.

McCullough, Tom
1974 Urban Education, "It's No Big Thing." Urban Education 9:117-135.

McLaurin, Melton
1971 Images of Negroes in Deep South Public School State History Texts. Phylon 32:237-246.

Meranto, Philip
1969 School Desegregation: Urban and Suburban. Education and Urban Society 1:231-235.

Montague, Ashley (Ed.)
1970 Race and IQ. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moore, G. Alexander, Jr.
1964 Realities of the Urban Classroom: Observations in Elementary Schools. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Moynihan, Daniel P.
1968 Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report. Harvard Educational Review 38:23-36.

Nelson, William C.
1972 The Storefront School: A Vehicle for Change. In Restructuring American Education. Ray C. Rist, Ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books. pp. 223-235.

Newby, Robert G., and David B. Tyack
1971 Victims Without "Crimes": Some Historical Perspectives on Black Education. Journal of Negro Education 40:192-206.

Noar, Gertrude
1966 The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Oberle, Wayne H.
1974 Role Models of Black and White Rural Youth at Two Stages of Adolesence. Journal of Negro Education 43:233-244.

Ogbu, John U.
1974 The Next Generation. New York: Academic Press.

Orfield, Gary
1969 The Reconstruction of Southern Education. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

1975 Examining the Desegregation Process. Integrated Education 13: 127-130.

1976 Untitled. Social Policy 6:24-31.

Orstein, Allan C.
1971 The Need for Research on Teaching the Disadvantaged. Journal of Negro Education 40:133-139.

Pallone, Nathaniel J., Robert B. Hurley and Fred S. Richard
1973 Black Students and School Counselors: Rhetoric and Reality. School Counselor 20:259-279.

Pearl, Arthur
1972 The Atrocity of Education. St. Louis: New Critics Press.

Perley, Martin M.
1975 The Louisville Story. Integrateducation 78:11-14.

Perry, George A.
1973 A Better Chance: Evaluation of Student Attitudes and Academic Performance, 1964-1972. Boston, Massachusetts: A Better Chance.

Peterson, John H., Jr.
1975 Black-White Joking Relationships Among Newly Integrated Faculty. Integrated Education 13:33-37.

Petroni, Frank A. Ernest A. Hirsch and C. Lillian Petroni
1970 Two, Four, Six, Eight, When You Gonna Integrate? New York: Behavioral Publications.

Pettigrew, Ann Hallman, and Thomas F. Pettigrew
1963 Race, Disease and Desegregation: A New Look. Phylon 24:315-333.

Pettigrew, Thomas
1968 School Integration in Current Perspective. Urban Review 3:4-8.

1975 Racial Discrimination in the United States. New York: Harper and Row.

1975 The Cold Structural Inducements to Integration. Urban Review 8: 137-144.

Pettigrew, Thomas et al.
1973 Busing: A Review of the Evidence. The Public Interest 30: 88-118.

Phillips, W. M., Jr.
1975 Educational Policy, Community Participation, and Race. Journal of Negro Education 44:256-267.

Preston, James D., and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr.
1974 On Modification of Interracial Interaction. American Sociological Review 39:283-285.

Prichard, Paul N.
1969 Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City School. Integrated Education 7:33-37.

Rafky, David M.
1972 Blue-Collar Power: The Social Impact of Urban School Custodians. Urban Education 6:349-371, 7:5-32.

Ravitch, Diane
1976 Integration, Segregation, Pluralism. American Scholar 45: 206-217.

Read, Frank T.
1975 Judicial Evolution of the Law of School Integration Since Brown v. Board of Education. Law and Contemporary Problems, Part I (Winter):7-49.

Redl, Fritz
1975 Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom. School Review 83:569-594.

Reimer, Everett W.
1970 School is Dead: Alternatives in Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

Richardson, Ken, David Spears and Martin Richards (Eds.)
1972 Race and Intelligence. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books.

Richer, Stephen
1974 Middle-Class Bias-Fact or Fancy? Sociology of Education 47: 523-534.

Rist, Ray C.
1970 Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Review 40:416-451.

1972 Restructuring American Education: Innovations and Alternatives. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

1972 The Milieu of a Ghetto School as a Precipitator of Educational Failure. Phylon 33:348-360.

1973 The Urban School: Factory for Failure. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

1974 Busing White Children into Black Schools: A Study in Controversy. Integrated Education 12:13-18.

1974 Race Policy in Schooling. Trans-Action/Society 12:59-64.

1976 School Integration and Minority Student Tokenism. Integrateducation 14:18-20.

Rosenbaum, James E.
1975 The Stratification of Socialization Process. American Sociological Review 40:48-54.

Rosenberg, Morris, and Roberta G. Black
1971 Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child. Arnold M. and Caroline Rose Monograph Series, American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.

Rosenthal, Robert, and Lenore Jacobson
1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.

Rossell, Christine H.
1975a School Desegregation and White Flight. Political Science Quarterly 90:675-695.

1975b White Flight. Integrateducation. November-December, No. 78.

Rubin, Samuel S., and Alice Pisciotto
1974 Racial Interaction in School and Society. New York: Vantage Press.

Ryan, William
1965 Racial Imbalance, Cultural Deprivation, and Reading Achievement. Mimeograph (Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education, background paper, No. 7): Massachusetts State Board of Education.

St. John, Nancy
1975 School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

St. John, Nancy H., and Ralph G. Lewis
1975 Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom. Sociology of Education 48:346-368.

Saunders, Robert J., and Ronald L. Coccari
1973 Racial Earnings Differentials: Some Economic Factors. The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 32:225-233.

Schafer, Walter E., and Carol Olexa
1971 Tracking and Opportunity: The Locking-Out Process and Beyond. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company.

Schrag, Peter
1967 Village School Downtown: Politics and Education-A Boston Report. Boston: Beacon Press.

Schreck, Robert, Lubbie Harper, Jr. and Norman N. Goroff
1975 Metamorphosis of Lee High School. Urban Education 10:198-211.

Sexton, Patricia
1968 City Schools, Inequality and Modified Class Struggle. In Readings on the School in Society. Patricia Sexton, Ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. pp. 131-137.

Silberman, Charles
1970 Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House.

Silverman, Irvin, and Marvin E. Shaw
1973 Effects of Sudden Mass School Desegregation on Interracial Interaction and Attitudes in One Southern City. Journal of Social Issues 29:133-142.

Singleton, Robert
1975 The Black Child and Equity in School Finance: Analysis and Alternatives. Journal of Negro Education 44:271-207.

Smith, Charles V.
1975 Public School Desegregation and the Law. Social Forces 54: 317-327.

Smith, Paul M., Jr.
1971 The Role of the Guidance Counselor in the Desegregation Process. Journal of Negro Education 40:347-351.

Solomon, Victor
1970 An Alternative to Segregation: A Proposal for Community School Districts. In School Desegregation Retrospect and Prospect. Dr. Eugene C. Lee, Ed. Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation. pp. 133-147.

Stein, Anne
1971 Strategies for Failure. Harvard Educational Review 41:158-204.

Stewart, Charles E.
1965 Racial Issues Confronting Large City School Administrators. Urban Education 1:202-214.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L., Mary McDill and Dollie Walker
1969 Is There a Racial Tipping Point in Changing Schools? Journal of Social Issues 25:127-136.

Stones, Micheal E.
1971 School Administrator Attitudes and Racism. Integrated Education 9:54-59.

Strauss, George H.
1974 School as Power Structure Student Attitudes Toward High School Policies, Student Power Position, and Student Rights Movement. Education and Urban Society 7:3-27.

Sullivan, Allen R.
1972 The influence of Social Processes on the Learning Abilities of Afro-American School Children: Some Educational Implications. Journal of Negro Education 41:127-136.

Swanson, Bert
1969 Psycho-Political Patterns of School Desegregation: Mount Vernon, New York. Education and Urban Society 1:193-230.

Taylor, William L., John E. Benjes and Eric E. Wright
1976 School Desegregation and the Courts. Social Policy 6:32-35.

Teele, James E., and Clara Mayo
1969 School Racial Integration: Tumult and Shame. Journal of Social Issues 25:137-156.

Thelen, Herbert A.
1954 Dynamics of Groups at Work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tobier, Arthur
1975 School Integration: An Ongoing Theme. Urban Review 8:134-136.

Tucker, Sterling
1971 Black Strategies for Change in America. Journal of Negro Education 40:297-311.

Turbowitz, Stanley
1971 Confessions of a Ghetto Administrator. In Crisis in Urban Schools. Thomas E. Glass, Ed. New York: MSS Information Corp. pp. 215-223.

Tyack, David B.
1974 The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Valentine, Charles
1968 Culture and Poverty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Venn, Grant
1964 Man, Education and Work. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Watts, Walter Normon
1973 Liberation and Freedom in an Urban Learning Community: A Rationale for a Comprehensive Education Model for Afro-Americans. New York: MSS Information Corp.

Weinberg, Meyer
1970 The Education of the Minority Child. Chicago: Integrated Education Associates.

1971 Schooling and the New Parenthood. Journal of Negro Education 40:207-215.

1975 The Relationship Between School Desegregation and Academic Achievement: A Review of the Research. Law and Contemporary Problems 35:241-270.

Wiles, David K.
1970 The Mosaic Composition of Urban School Teachers. Urban Education 5:141-150.

Willerman, Marvin
1975 Interruption Behavior in the Elementary School Classroom. Illinois School Research 11:19-27.

Wilson, A. B.
1968 Social Class and Equal Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review 38:77-84.

Winecoff, Larry H., and Eugene W. Kelly, Jr.
1971 Problems in School Desegregation: Real or Imaginary? Integrated Education 9:3-10.

Wittmer, Joe
1971 Effective Counseling of Children of Several American Subcultures. The School Counselor 19:49-52.

Wolf, Ronald M.
1964 The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to General Intelligence. University of Chicago: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Woodard, Samuel L.
1965 Belief Congruence Theory and School Integration. Urban Education 2:169-173.

Woodworth, William D., and Richard T. Salzer
1971 Black Children's Speech and Teachers' Evaluations. Urban Education 6:167-172.

Yudof, Marg G.
1975 Suspension and Expulsion of Black Students from the Public School: Academic Capital Punishment and the Constitution. In Law and Contemporary Problems 39:374-411.

Ziegler, Harmon, and Micheal Boss
1974 Racial Problems and Policy in the American Public Schools. Sociology of Education 47:319-336.